

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XV, Issue No. 12

June 2010

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

Elena Kagan's Opposition to Gun Rights

By Ken Klukowski

Elena Kagan's opposing Americans' Second Amendment right to own a gun is sure to become a major issue in her Supreme Court confirmation hearings. Her nomination confirms that President Obama's gun-control agenda is to create a Supreme Court that will "reinterpret" the Second Amendment until it means nothing at all.

This year no case on the Court's docket is more important than *McDonald v. Chicago*, where the Court will whether the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms is only a right you have against the federal government, or whether it also secures a right against state and local governments. At issue is whether Chicago's gun ban is constitutional.

When the Supreme Court considered its last Second Amendment case, *District of Columbia v. Heller*, in 2008, then-Solicitor General Paul Clement filed a brief and requested time to argue the federal government's position as to the meaning of the Second Amendment.

When the *McDonald* case was argued March 2, Solicitor General Kagan didn't file a brief (which is routinely done in important constitutional cases like *McDonald*), where the issue is whether the Second Amendment is "incorporated" to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment. The last time the Supreme Court "incorporated" a right from the Bill of Rights to the states, in *Benton v. Maryland* in 1969, the solicitor general filed a brief, and then (just like *Heller* in 2008) got time to express the government's views in front of the Court.

Why wouldn't Kagan file a brief expressing the view of over 75% of

Americans that the Second Amendment is an individual right, one that every American citizen has against all levels of government?

Aside from her shocking decision not to file a brief, we've learned that Elena Kagan was part of the Clinton White House's gun-control efforts, where a Clinton staffer said, "We are taking the law and bending it as far as we can to capture a whole new class of guns."

When the Supreme Court was asked in 1987 to rule on the D.C. gun ban (the same law that the Court struck down in *Heller*), Kagan wrote Supreme Court Justice Marshall that she was "not sympathetic" toward the argument that the Second Amendment doesn't allow D.C. to completely ban all guns.

The bottom line is that Barack Obama supports the Chicago gun ban, a position he repeated June 26, 2008 (the day the *Heller* decision was released). President Obama believes that there's nothing unconstitutional about the city or even the state from completely banning firearms for hunting or self-defense, even in your own home.

As my co-author Ken Blackwell and I discuss in our bestselling book, *The Blueprint: Obama's Plan to Subvert the Constitution and Build an Imperial Presidency*, President Obama's gun-control agenda is to create a Supreme Court that will repeatedly rule that whatever gun-control laws come before it are okay. No matter how severe the anti-gun measure is, the Court will say, "This is constitutional."

President Obama, the most anti-gun president in American history, has nominated for our highest court a close personal friend. And now we see that Obama has every reason to believe that she shares his radical view on the Second Amendment, one that will work

against the constitutional rights of 90 million American gun owners.
-- <http://townhall.com/columnists> May 13, 2010

US Navy veterans continue to seek justice for Israeli attack

By Dahr Jamail

[On May 31, 2010] the Israeli military attacked a flotilla of international peace activists, killing as many as 19 civilians carrying aid to break the Israeli blockade of Gaza. This is not the first time the Israeli military has attacked a nonthreatening entity in international waters.

On June 8, 1967 the intelligence ship USS *Liberty* was attacked by Israeli air and naval forces. Of the *Liberty's* crew of 294, more than half were killed or wounded. More than 40 years later, survivors are still seeking justice.

The Israeli forces attacked with full knowledge that the *Liberty* was an American ship, yet survivors have been forbidden to tell their story under oath to the American public.

Joe Meadors, who was on the *Liberty* told Truthout, "The attack lasted 90 minutes, during which we got a message off to the 6th fleet asking for assistance. Joe Tully, commanding the USS *Saratoga*, launched aircraft, but they were recalled. We found this out 20 years later."

Meadors and his group, the USS *Liberty* Veterans Association, believe that Rear Adm. Lawrence Geis, the Sixth Fleet carrier division commander, was following orders from Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who called off the rescue mission for the USS *Liberty*.

In 2003 a commission headed by Adm. Thomas H. Moorer (Ret.) reported: "Israel launched a two-hour air

and naval attack against USS Liberty ... Israeli torpedo boats later returned to machine-gun at close range three of the Liberty's life rafts that had been lowered into the water by survivors to rescue the most seriously wounded ... Israel's attack was a deliberate attempt to destroy an American ship and kill her entire crew."

Ray McGovern, a retired senior CIA analyst, said that, in his view, the attack on the Liberty is "the archetypical example of how Israel was given convincing affirmation of its belief that it can get away with murder, literally, and the US Gulliver would be bound to ignore it ... or even mount 'official' inquiries to explain it away."

Bryce Lockwood, who was awarded the Silver Star for saving at least one wounded sailor's life, thinks Moshe Dayan, the Israeli Defense Minister, ordered the attack.

"I only learned recently, via a document released by the CIA, that our ship had the capability of monitoring virtually everything ... all communications. The Israelis had nuclear capability, and it was extremely important to the Johnson administration that the Israelis not use the nuclear option. We could monitor all of this.... that's why they attacked us."

Lockwood is certain that the attack was deliberate because he watched Joe Meadors hoist three US flags up a pole in an attempt to insure the Israeli pilots knew they were firing on a US ship.

"The Israelis claim they didn't see a US flag, but they shot down two, and Joe raised three of them, since they kept firing on them," Lockwood explained.

In his memoirs, Richard Helms, the director of Central Intelligence at the time of the attack, explained that the CIA undertook a "final" investigation after more evidence became available: "Israeli authorities subsequently apologized for the incident, but few in Washington could believe that the ship had not been identified as an American naval vessel. Later, an interim intelligence memorandum concluded the attack was a mistake and not made in malice against the US.... I had no role in the board of inquiry that followed, or the board's finding that there could be no doubt that the Israelis knew exactly what they were doing in attacking the Liberty. I have yet to understand why it was felt necessary to attack this ship or who ordered the attack."

Meadors is measured in his

explanation of how he perceives the politics behind the lack of an investigation. "Politicians feel the Israeli lobby is so powerful, that if they do anything about this it will cost them votes. Nobody thinks it was a mistake, everybody knows it was deliberate. But they won't investigate it because they feel it would damage the relationship between the US and Israel."

Both Meadors and Lockwood urge people to contact their Congressional representatives and demand an investigation.

-- www.truthout.org, June 1, 2010

Miss USA 2010, the accidental Muslim feminist

By Alan Kornman

Rima Fakhri is the Lebanese-American beauty pageant winner of Miss USA 2010, on May 16, 2010 at the Planet Hollywood Resort & Casino in Las Vegas.

Rima Fakhri may end up becoming the accidental role model for Muslim women around the world. I believe she has the opportunity within her grasp to be the face of the Muslim Global Women's Rights Movement that will spring up out of thin air in the Islamist world – or not. Rima's beauty, intelligence, poise, and self confidence will inspire Muslim women to demand the right to openly share their outward and inner beauty without shame or fear.

Political Islam requires Muslims to follow a strict set of Islamic laws called Shariah Law. Shariah Law applies to all aspects of one's personal life, government, how you pray, community interactions, family law, and even personal hygiene. In the majority of Islamists eyes Rima left Islam forsaking Allah and is technically an apostate. Rima did this by allowing risqué pictures to be made public, participating in infidel beauty pageants, pole dancing in public, endorsing contraception, and celebrating Christmas while being Muslim. ***In Islam being guilty of apostasy to Allah is worse than committing murder and the punishment for apostasy is death. One thing all four major schools of Islamic Jurisprudence agree on is that apostates should be killed.***

Rima describes Dearborn Michigan, her hometown, as a "little on the strict side." Meaning that Shariah compliance are carefully observed by the fundamental Islamists. These Mosque leaders are most likely responsible for the "grumbings" the

Fakhri family has heard.

Lucky for Rima her parents encouraged her dreams. Strict adherents to Political Islam may not be as understanding. ***Rima is technically an Apostate for forsaking her submission to Allah. Apostasy is such a serious crime in Islam anyone from the Islamic community can carry out the punishment. The punishment for Apostasy is death.***

Rima Fakhri is in a position where she can speak out in favor of women's rights not only in the Islamist world. Rima can deliver powerful messages to young Muslim women that the female body is something to be celebrated not covered up, controlled, and subjugated. Once the body is free, Muslim women can demand the right to marry non-Muslim men, demand equal distribution of an inheritance, demand the ability to divorce and maintain custody of the children, date openly, demand equal pay for equal work, and the list goes on. ***In order for Islam to reform itself, if that is at all possible, a robust and assertive Muslim women's rights movement around the world is a mandatory first step.***

If Rima chooses to advocate women's rights in Political Islam, which I hope she does, much good can come of it. But there will be a large segment of the male dominated Islamist world that will turn those grumbings into an internal Islamic political war. If you are a Muslim male life can be very good from a certain perspective. In Islam men can have four wives, divorce a wife by saying I divorce you three times and not lose half their personal wealth. Men are allowed to have temporary contractual marriages "Law of Desire" for as little as 15 minutes or as long as three days – I call that prostitution. Men get a greater share of inheritance money than women. Men get to pray in the front of the Mosque – no ladies allowed. Men are allowed to marry non-Muslim women, and men are allowed to beat their wives. Women on the other hand can only have one husband and a divorce is very difficult to get. If a woman is sexually active with a man who is not her husband she is severely punished possibly resulting in an honor killing. Women can not beat their husbands or marry non-Muslim men. If a woman is raped and does not have four male witnesses to the rape, she is stoned to death in some countries. Now you can understand a little better how celebrated or reviled Rima Fakhri is going to be in the Islamist world.

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. – Mark Twain

Muhammad the supposed last and final prophet put women in their place. Muhammad said, "Women are captives in your hands" rendering them to slave status. Muhammad said, "Your wives are as a tilth (as a field to be ploughed) unto you, so approach your tilth when or how ye will." Now you understand why women's rights are so needed in the Islamist culture where Shariah Law is the rule of the land. Rima has her work cut out for her because Muhammad in all his wisdom laid down the law about subjugating women as it was transmitted to him from the Angel Gabriel's mouth from Allah himself.

The facts and information I provided for you are a "controlled substance" purposefully hidden from non-Muslims. Use this information for good and write letters to Rima asking her to stand up for women's rights in Political Islam. Let's all hope and pray Rima Fakhri, Miss America 2010, will advocate and inspire Muslim women to demand equal rights as Muslim men in America and the world.

-- www.nationalwriterssyndicate, May 20, 2010

The Stoning of Soraya M

Book, published 1994; banned in Iran Film, released 2008

Stranded in a remote Iranian village, French-Iranian journalist Freidoune Sahebjam is approached by Zahra, a woman with a harrowing tale to tell about her niece, Soraya, and the bloody circumstances of her death the day before. Her story attempts to expose the inhumanity of Sharia Law.

Soraya M.'s husband Ghorban-Ali wanted a way out of his marriage in order to marry a 14 year old girl but did not want to support two families or return Soraya's dowry. When Soraya began cooking for a friend's widowed husband, he found his excuse: abetted by village authorities, he accused his wife of adultery. She was taken away, buried up to her waist, and then stoned to death.

A \$439 72-hour survival kit

Here's what you'll find in ASAP Survival Gear's \$439 "Starter Survival Pack: essential for 2 people for 72 hours"

- * Your Survival - by Dr. Bob Arnot
- * 36 Emergency drinking water packets
- * 18 Emergency Food Rations
- * 1 Headlamp
- * 1 Crank powered AM/FM/NOAA emergency radio/charger
- * 1 GPS
- * 1 Leatherman "Super Tool 300"
- * 1 "Weekender" First-Aid Kit

- * 1 1L water bottle
- * 2 Heatsheets Emergency Blankets
- * 2 Thermo-Lite 2 bivy sacks
- * Wind & waterproof matches with case
- * 8 Wet fire tinder cubes
- * 1 whistle
- * 2 Vinyl Ponchos
- * 2 Cyalume Lightsticks (8-12 hrs each)
- * 1 Sharpie marking pen
- * Storage bag

Ed: I bet \$439 I could assemble a similar kit for a whole lot less.

As California goes, so goes...

From the L.A. Times

1. 40% of all workers in Los Angeles County (population 10.2 million) are working for cash and not paying taxes. This is because they are predominantly illegal aliens.

2. 95% of warrants for murder in L.A. are for illegal aliens.

3. 75% of people on the most wanted list in L.A. are illegal aliens.

4. Over 2/3 of all births in L.A. County are to illegal alien Mexicans on Medi-Cal, whose births were paid for by taxpayers.

5. Nearly 35% of all inmates in California detention centers are Mexican nationals here illegally.

6. Over 300,000 illegal aliens in L.A. County are living in garages.

7. The FBI reports half of all gang members in L.A. are most likely illegal aliens from south of the border.

8. Nearly 60% of all occupants of HUD properties are here illegally.

9. 21 radio stations in L.A. are Spanish speaking.

10. In L.A. County, 3.9 million speak Spanish.

(All 10 of the above facts were published in the L.A. Times)

Less than 2% of illegal aliens are picking our crops, but 29% are on welfare.

Over 70% of the United States' annual population growth (over 90% in California, Florida and New York) results from immigration.

29% of inmates in federal prisons are illegal aliens.

-- From an email circulating on the Internet

More Guns, Less Crime, 3d Edition (2010)

On its initial publication in 1998, John R. Lott's *More Guns, Less Crime* drew both lavish praise and heated criticism. Today, with 180 pages of new material, it continues to play a key role in ongoing arguments over gun-control laws. Relying on a comprehensive data analysis of crime

statistics and right-to-carry laws, the third edition of the book challenges common perceptions about the relationship of guns, crime, and violence. Drawing on an additional 10 years of data — including provocative analysis of the effects of gun bans in Chicago and Washington, DC — Lott's claims lend even more support to his central contention that more guns mean less crime.

For example, Lott's third edition shows that in the 17 years after Chicago's ban on new handguns went into effect, there are only two years where the murder rate was as low as it was in 1982. The murder rate fell relative to the largest 50 cities prior to the ban and rose relative to them afterwards. In 1982 Chicago's murder rate went from equalling the average, to exceeding it by 32 percent in 1992 and by 68 percent in 2002. There is no year after the ban that Chicago's murder rate fared as well relative to other cities as it did in 1982. Similar comparisons exist for the top ten largest cities, the US as a whole, and the counties that border Chicago. In the five years before the ban, Chicago's murder rate fell 28 percent relative to those counties - county crime data only goes back to 1977 - in the five years after the ban, Chicago's murder rate doubled relative to those counties.

Lott presents research on the effects of the federal and state "assault weapons" bans, and on "Castle Doctrine" laws now in place in more than half the states. And just as the first edition of his book helped convince many reluctant state politicians to adopt right-to-carry (RTC) laws, his new book should play a similar role in supporting current efforts to expand RTC in a number of states. Lott presents the number of permit holders in each carry-permit state, and articulates the relatively low incidence of crime among permit-holders and the contribution that people who carry firearms lawfully make to reducing crime.

With the threat of international gun control agreements still very much alive, Lott also documents how every place in the world that has adopted a ban on guns has experienced an increase in murder rates, often suddenly and dramatically.

The third edition of *More Guns, Less Crime* is a "must-read" for anyone who wants to be armed with the scientifically-proven evidence that reducing gun controls and increasing the ability of Americans to exercise their right to arms has helped make America a more free and less dangerous place in which to live.

Available in paperback for \$10.08 from Amazon.com

Ban proposed on non "sporting" guns

Democrat Rep. Carolyn McCarthy incorrectly claims that she has introduced legislation to "reinstate" the "assault rifle" ban. She has repeatedly introduced legislation, of course, but not to reinstate the ban but rather to apply the "assault weapon" label to far more firearms than were covered by the expired law, including the M1 Garand service rifle, the Ruger 10/22, and any semi-automatic shotgun or rifle a future attorney general might claim is not "sporting."

-- NRA/ILA Grassroots Alert, Vol. 17, No. 20, May 21, 2010

Reagan fails RNC's Reaganite principles

The Republican National Committee recently toyed with the idea of imposing a purity test on potential GOP candidates. Comply with eight of the party's 10 "Reaganite" principles, the thinking went, and you're worthy of funding. Fall short, and you might as well be Leon Trotsky.

The RNC cites Pres. Ronald Reagan's alleged "principles"—"smaller government, smaller national debt, lower deficits, and lower taxes." True, the Gipper slashed taxes dramatically during his first year in office, but the rest of his fiscal record violated the very rules the RNC created in his honor. During the Reagan years (1981-89) federal employment grew by more than 60,000. The national debt soared from \$700 billion to \$3 trillion, and the U.S. was transformed from the world's largest international creditor to its largest debtor. Reagan raised taxes in 1982, 1983, 1984, and 1986. The 1983 payroll tax hike even helped fund Medicare and Social Security—or, in terms today's Tea Partiers might recognize, "government-run health care" and "socialism."

As governor of California, Reagan expanded Medi-Cal, the nation's largest Medicaid program. He signed more wilderness-protection laws than any other president. In 1986, Reagan signed the Immigration Reform and Control Act, which granted amnesty to 2.7 million illegal immigrants. Reagan was a staunch backer of the Brady gun control bill, urging Congress in 1991 to "enact it without further delay. To win the RNC's blessing, according to the purity test, a candidate would've had to support eight of 10 so-called Reaganite

principles. But Reagan himself wouldn't have come close.

In 1967, he signed a California law that legalized millions of abortions. In 1981, he nominated Sandra Day O'Connor to the Supreme Court. She, along with one of Reagan's other nominees, Anthony Kennedy, voted to uphold *Roe v. Wade*.

As Peter Beinart has put it, "Turns out this Reagan guy wasn't really that Reaganite after all."

-- *Newsweek*, May 10, 2010

An entourage more royal than the queen's

By Dale McFeatters

President Obama showed up at the G20 summit in London with 500 staff in tow, including 200 Secret Service agents, a team of six doctors, the White House chef and kitchen staff with the president's food and water.

And, according to the *Evening Standard*, he also came with "35 vehicles in all, four speech writers and 12 teleprompters." For sure our president is not going to be at a loss for words.

The press duly reported on Air Force One and all its bells and whistles but also on the presence of the presidential helicopter Marine Corps One, and a fleet of identical decoys to ferry him from Stansted airport to London.

Among all those vehicles is the presidential limousine, which one local newspaper mistakenly called Cadillac One, but is universally referred to as the Beast. The limo, reinforced with ceramic and titanium armor, carries tear gas cannon, night vision devices and its own oxygen and is resistant to chemical and radiation attacks. It is, marveled one reporter, a sort of mobile panic room. The *Guardian* called it "the ultimate in heavily armored transport."

Surely, when we're trying to project a more humble, restrained image to the world, the president's huge retinue could be scaled back to something less than the triumphal march from "Aida."

-- www.scrippsnews.com, Mar. 31, 2010

Creative thinking at the CIA

During planning for the 2003 invasion of Iraq, the CIA kicked around a number of ideas for discrediting Saddam Hussein.

One was to create a video purporting to show the Iraqi dictator having sex with a teenage boy, according to two former CIA officials familiar with the project.

Another idea was to interrupt Iraqi television programming with a fake special news bulletin. An actor playing Hussein would announce that he was stepping down in favor of his (much-reviled) son Uday.

"I'm sure you will throw your support behind His Excellency Uday," the fake Hussein would intone.

The spy agency's Office of Technical Services collaborated on the ideas, which included inserting fake "crawls" -- messages at the bottom of the screen -- into Iraqi newscasts.

The agency actually did make a video purporting to show Osama bin Laden and his cronies sitting around a campfire swigging bottles of liquor and savoring their conquests with boys.

Eventually, "things ground to a halt," the other former officer said, because of strong opposition from James Pavitt, then head of the agency's Operations Division.

The ideas "came from people whose careers were spent in Latin America or East Asia" and didn't understand the cultural nuances of the region.

"Saddam playing with boys would have no resonance in the Middle East -- nobody cares," agreed a former CIA official with extensive experience in the region. "We always mistake our own taboos as universal when, in fact, they are just our taboos."

A U.S. official, speaking on condition of anonymity, declined to confirm the accounts, or deny them.

"The agency got rid of most of its non-paramilitary covert action in the 1980s, after Bill Casey died," said the third former official. "He was a big fan of covert action, but neither Bob Gates, who succeeded him, or any after him, wanted anything to do with it."

According to histories of the 2003 invasion, the single most effective "information warfare" project, which originated in the Pentagon, was to send faxes and e-mails to Iraqi unit commanders, telling them their situation was hopeless, to round up their tanks, artillery and men, and go home.

Many did.

-- *Washington Post*, May 25, 2010

Commentary: the idea that the CIA has abandoned activities of this kind is absurd. It should make one suspect that this story was planted by the CIA as disinformation to convince everyone that such activities are not occurring today.

The truth police

The Canadian government has been monitoring political messages

online, and even correcting what it considers misinformation.

Under the pilot program the Harper government paid a media company \$75,000 to respond to online postings about the east coast seal hunt.

--www.news1030.com, May 23, 2010

Bilderberg cabal huddles in Spain

By Anita Brooks

If the conspiracy theorists are on to something, the Bilderbergers could be plotting the invasion of Iran, planning the funeral of the Euro or scheming to wipe out French poodles in pink sweaters.

Or perhaps the world's financial and political leaders are simply enjoying a "chocolate massage" followed by the "honey body scrub" at the luxury Dolce Hotel's spa in Sitges.

Or maybe they came to the elegant seaside town near Barcelona to study the booming gay tourist market there and to sneak a preview of next year's international horror film festival.

But ordinary citizens can only guess at the goings-on at the annual meeting of the secretive Bilderberg Group, a media-barred pow-wow of the global elite that in the past has reportedly attracted US President Bill Clinton and US treasury secretary Timothy Geithner.

The heavyweight weekend retreat kicked off yesterday with hordes of police security and a gag order for employees. None of the illustrious guests posed for photos or spouted prepared statements for the media. Instead, activists, journalists and bloggers attempted to stake out positions in the surrounding hills to catch glimpses of this year's participants.

Hannah Borno, co-founder of an activist agency, Trilever, which is calling for transparency on the Bilderberg deliberations, paid €135 for the hotel's cheapest room for the chance to see the preparations – as well as swarming secret service agents – before being forced to leave for a nearby campsite, surrounded by police. Overhead: a no-fly zone.

Some people consider the Bilderberg Group, founded in 1954, an innocent brainstorming session, but the cloak-and-dagger theorists scored a point this week when the self-appointed Bilderberg expert Daniel Estulin addressed the European Parliament on the invitation of an Italian member, Mario Borghesio.

Mr Estulin, who has written two best-selling books on the subject,

contends that "the Bilderberg Club" is not a classic conspiracy but a potentially dangerous meeting of minds with a common goal: to centralise global economic power to benefit corporations. He defined it as "a virtual spider web of interlocking financial, political and industrial interests".

"It isn't a secret society," he said.

Secret society or not, the speculation surrounding Bilderberg rivals the eternal question of who shot JFK. It is impossible to confirm who has checked into the spiffy Dolce But according to press leaks, this year's A-list participants include Queen Beatrix of Holland, Spain's Queen Sofia, World Trade Organisation Director Pascal Lamy, European Central Bank President Jean-Claude Trichet, and former NATO chief Jaap de Hoop Scheffer.

Extremadura Progresista, a left-wing newspaper, published a list of participants, including executives from Siemens AG, Microsoft, Royal Dutch Shell, Chase Manhattan Bank and Morgan Stanley International.

And what might this all-star cast be discussing between forkfuls of paella and sips of cava on a warm summer's eve? Topics reportedly include everything from the possible failure of the euro and the creation of a global currency, to a military strike against Iran.

Another issue supposedly on the agenda is the financial meltdown in Greece, where last year's session was held. The irony is not lost on Spanish activists, who hope the Bilderberg "witches' Sabbath" does not brew bad tidings for the troubled Spanish economy. "We joke that the horror film festival is starting early," Didac Sanchez, an activist, told The Independent amid background chanting. "The monsters are here."

-- www.independent.co.uk, 4 June 2010

Supremes: Speak up if you want to remain silent

By a 5-4 vote, the Supreme Court said that once rights have been read and questioning begun, a suspect must clearly declare that he wants to remain silent and cannot simply be silent.

The case addressed what happens when a suspect declines to answer hours of questions, then makes a potentially incriminating statement and later says he had wanted to remain silent and that his statement was not made freely.

Van Chester Thompsons, suspected in a 2000 shooting death in

Southfield, Mich., said little during a nearly three-hour interrogation, at the start of which he was read Miranda warnings.

Two hours and 45 minutes later, an officer asked, "Do you believe in God?" Thompsons said yes. The officer then asked, "Do you pray to God to forgive you for shooting that boy down?" Thompsons said "Yes."

Thompsons was convicted of murder and sentenced to life in prison without parole.

On appeal, he said he invoked his right to remain silent by refusing to answer questions for a long period of time and that his statements should not have been used at trial.

A U.S. appeals court agreed, rejecting Michigan officials' claim that Thompsons had waived his rights. U.S. Solicitor General Elena Kagan, representing the Obama administration and now a nominee for the court, sided with Michigan in its appeal. She said a suspect must clearly assert his right to silence.

The Supreme Court majority agreed.

-- USA Today, June 1, 2010

Ed.: "You have the right to remain silent....." Now speak up if you want to be silent! Bizarre as that may be, if you're ever arrested, be sure to speak out and tell the police that you wish to remain silent!

Misquoting court decisions

By Larry Becraft

This "movement" is perhaps best known for spreading lots of erroneous information, particularly [made up] quotes from cases of all sorts. For example, I ran across this alleged quote just today:

"Therefore, the U.S. citizens residing in one of the states of the union, are classified as property and franchises of the feds as an individual entity," *Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Fox*, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L.Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773. There is nothing in the case that relates to U.S. citizens; in fact, the word citizen appears nowhere in that case.

About 9 years ago, Vic Varjabedian wrote a wild book titled "Cracking the Code," different from Pete Handrickson's book of the same title. It alleged that the case of "Penhallow v Doanes Administraters" ruled as follows (this is from my website):

"Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The

imaginary – having neither actuality nor substance – is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. therefor can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them." I have posted this case at <http://supreme.justicia.com/us/3/54/>. Please download it, run "search" and learn that the above "quote" appears nowhere in the case.

This is just another example of people misrepresenting and misquoting cases [and in fact fabricating quotes]. Spreading lies like these does incredible harm to this movement, making most of its participants appear to be fools.

-- becraft@hiwaay.net 30 May 2010

The U.N. and Mexico have U.S. gun owners in their sights

Two major meetings will occur at the United Nations (UN) in New York over the next several weeks. They are the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms in all its Aspects, ("BMS4") June 14-18, and the Arms Trade Treaty Preparatory Committee ("ATT Prep. Com.") July 12-23.

The BMS4 is a continuation of the so-called "Programme of Action" (POA) adopted by the UN at a conference in 2001. Anti-gun groups saw the original POA as a vehicle for UN gun bans, registration schemes and other radical proposals. The U.S., through the efforts of Ambassador John Bolton, forced the removal of provisions targeting privately-owned firearms from the POA. It was not able to stop the POA itself, and the UN holds "Biennial" meetings every two years to keep the POA alive. Heavily-funded anti-gun groups will again attempt to get the UN and its member states to target the right to arms at the BMS4. A Mexican diplomat will chair the meeting and Mexico, which blames its crime problems on the U.S., is now pushing

for more gun control in America.
-- NRA/ILA Grassroots Alert, Vol 17, No. 23, June 11, 2010

Firearms industry responds to Mexico's call for U.S. assault rifle ban

NEWTOWN, Conn. -- Following calls by Mexican President Felipe Calderon that the United States re-institute a ban on modern sporting rifles, or so-called "assault weapons," the National Shooting Sports Foundation (NSSF) -- the trade association for America's firearms industry -- issued the following statement:

"While we respect the work of President Calderon to willingly take on his country's powerful drug cartels, we are disappointed that he, in the name of security, would urge our Congress to reinstitute a failed ban on so-called 'assault weapons.'

"...Some 29,000 firearms were recovered in Mexico in 2008, of which approximately 5,000 were traced to U.S. sources. That means more than 80 percent of the firearms recovered in Mexico were not traced to the United States. Furthermore, according to the ATF, those firearms traced were originally sold at retail not recently, but on average 14 years earlier. This is completely inconsistent with any notion that a flood of newly purchased firearms are being illegally smuggled over the border into Mexico. And let's not forget, no retail firearms sale can be made in the U.S. until after a criminal background check on the purchaser has been completed.

"In recent years as many as 150,000 Mexican soldiers, 17,000 last year alone, defected to go work for the drug cartels - bringing their American-made service-issued firearms with them. It has also been well documented that the drug cartels are illegally smuggling fully automatic firearms, grenades and other weapons into Mexico from South and Central America. Such items are not being purchased at retail firearms stores in the United States....

"Again, we applaud President Calderon for taking steps to stop the

cartels when past Mexican administrations paid only lip service and allowed rampant corruption to fester. Still, it is wrong for anyone to blame the Second Amendment and America's firearms industry for the problems Mexico is currently facing."

-- NSSF news release, May 20, 2010

The birth of American independence

In the area of customs, writs of assistance were first authorized by the English Parliament in 1660. Such writs served as general search warrants that did not expire, allowing customs officials to search anywhere for smuggled goods without having to obtain a specific search warrant. These writs became controversial when they were issued by British courts in colonial America, especially the Province of Massachusetts Bay. Writs of assistance inspired the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which forbids general search warrants.

"In 1761 the validity of the use of the Writs [of Assistance] was contested in the historic proceedings in Boston. James Otis attacked the Writ of Assistance because its use placed 'the liberty of every man in the hands of every petty officer.' [Otis argued: "This Writ is against the fundamental Principles of Law."] His powerful argument so impressed itself first on his audience and later on the People of all the Colonies that President Adams was in retrospect moved to say that 'American Independence was then and there born.' ... [It was therefore recognized that] the broad constitutional proscription [against Unauthorized Deprivation in the Due Process of Law clauses, includes] the right to shut the door on officials of the state unless their entry is under proper authority of law. [AND] self-protection: the right to resist unauthorized [deprivations of Life, Liberty and Property]" -- *Frank v. Maryland*, 359 U.S. 360 (1959)

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 783-2375

Wake County, NC, Dave (919) 521-4147

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$15.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State ____ Zip _____